

Exhibit 10

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
-----x

3 MOSES STRAUSS, et al.,
4 Plaintiffs,

5 -against-

6 CREDIT LYONNAIS, S.A.,
7 Defendants.

-----x
8 BERNICE WOLF, et al.,
9 Plaintiffs,

10 -against-

11 CREDIT LYONNAIS, S.A.,
12 Defendants.

-----x
13

14 One Liberty Plaza
15 New York, New York

16 September 28, 2010
17 9:40 a.m.

18 Videotaped Deposition of Expert
19 Witness, EMANUEL GROSS, before Shari Cohen,
20 a Notary Public of the State of New York.

21

22

23 ELLEN GRAUER COURT REPORTING CO. LLC
24 126 East 56th Street, Fifth Floor
25 New York, New York 10022
212-750-6434
REF: 94668

1 A P P E A R A N C E S:

2

3 OSEN LLC

4 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

5 700 Kinderkamack Road

6 Oradell, New Jersey 07649

7 BY: AARON SCHLANGER, ESQ.

8 PHONE 201-265-6400

9 FAX 201-265-0303

10 EMAIL au@osen.us

11

12

13 SHALOV STONE BONNER & ROCCO LLP

14 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

15 260 Madison Avenue

16 New York, New York 10016

17 BY: RALPH STONE, ESQ.

18 PHONE 212-239-4340

19 FAX 212-239-4310

20 EMAIL rstone@lawssb.com

21

22

23

24

25

1 A P P E A R A N C E S (CONT'D)

2

3 CLEARY GOTTlieb STEEN & HAMILTON LLP

4 Attorneys for Defendants

5 One Liberty Plaza

6 New York, New York 10006

7 BY: LARRY FRIEDMAN, ESQ.

8 EMILY PICONE ECKSTUT, ESQ.

9 PHONE 212-225-2432

10 FAX 212-225-3999

11 EMAIL aluft@cgsh.com

12

13

14 ALSO PRESENT:

15 DAN MACOM, Videographer

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 GROSS

2 A. Okay.

3 Q. Let's read the whole paragraph.

4 "From observations that the organization
5 B'Tselem conducted during the same period, it
6 appears that the majority of the trials are
7 not based on witness testimony while
8 convictions are based on confessions by the
9 accused. This finding casts great doubt on
10 the conclusion that proceedings before
11 military courts indeed lead to a just trial
12 notwithstanding the provisions we have
13 already discussed that apply the rules of
14 procedures and evidence prevailing in Israeli
15 law to the military courts." You said
16 earlier to your understanding 80 percent of
17 the convictions are based on confessions,
18 correct?

19 A. On plea.

20 Q. This statement by you that the
21 prevalence of confessions casts great doubt
22 on the conclusion that the proceedings indeed
23 lead to a just trial, that remains an
24 accurate observation by you not only in 2004,
25 but also 2005 and 2006, correct?

1 GROSS

2 MR. STONE: Objection to form.

3 A. Not quite. I want to explain.
4 What I was referring to the observation to
5 the report of the B'Tselem is that the
6 differences between the civil judicial system
7 and the military system grow some doubt or
8 the ability of the military court to provide
9 the same standard of justice.

10 Q. There were no changes that were
11 made with respect to the prevalence of
12 confessions in 2005 or 2006, correct?

13 A. I don't know, but once again
14 you are using the term confession and I would
15 prefer to use the term of plea bargain or
16 plea, but I also observed before that it's
17 not unique to the military system, by the
18 way, it's the same here in America.

19 Q. By plea you mean pleas which
20 are based on a confession to the crime to
21 which the defendant pleas?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. You then continue with another
24 quotation from Mr. Cox, correct, beginning
25 with the words contrary to the civil court's

1 GROSS

2 court must also find sufficient corroborative
3 evidence to establish guilt, correct?

4 A. Correct.

5 Q. That rule was in place at the
6 time you wrote what you wrote on page 466 of
7 your book?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. Let's go on to the next point
10 that you make here and that is about the use
11 of informers. You write quote in this area
12 of violations -- actually you quote Mr. Cox
13 saying --

14 MR. STONE: Where are you?

15 Q. I'm on page 466 continuing in
16 the same paragraph.

17 A. Just a moment, please.

18 Q. The first full paragraph on the
19 page you write -- you quote Mr. Cox's
20 statement that "In this area of violations
21 there is another factor fundamental and no
22 less complex from those that follow it. The
23 investigators discover most of the violations
24 using informers. People confess everything
25 and from confession to confession they

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

GROSS

incriminate other people. This is very dangerous and uncertain to decide the fate of a person on the basis of an informer and indictments are presented on the basis of these informers. This is a chain reaction; informer indictment confession punishment", do you see that?

A. Yes.

Q. You relied on this observation by Mr. Cox again for your same point about there being great doubt on the conclusion that proceedings before military courts indeed lead to a just trial, correct?

MR. STONE: Objection to form.

Q. That's why you offer this quotation?

A. Yes, but I do want to add something here just to clarify my points. I had my criticism about how to improve the system. It doesn't mean that at the time I wrote it or afterwards the judges were not able to make a fact finding process or to follow that kind of process that will enable them, you know, to get to a just result, but

1 GROSS

2 the same criticism I had also with the civil
3 judicial system because I was not happy that
4 according to the English system as different
5 from the European system the judge is able to
6 convict a person just based on his confession
7 alone.

8 Q. Now the last part of this
9 paragraph refers to the differential in
10 punishment and you quote Mr. Cox as saying,
11 "And if we mention punishment, the level of
12 punishment too does not give rise to equal
13 justice. When a Jew kills an Arab he can
14 receive a year in prison. When an Arab
15 throws a stone and no damage is caused he
16 receives a similar penalty. This is not a
17 just trial." You quote Mr. Cox's statement
18 to that effect?

19 A. And I agree.

20 Q. And you agree with it. If we
21 go to the next paragraph you wrote, "This is
22 the practical result of a military trial
23 that's different in composition from a
24 regular civil trial even when it purports to
25 apply procedures that are similar to the

1 GROSS

2 procedures that apply in the regular civil
3 courts. The outcome is deep erosion in the
4 basic right of every defendant to a fair
5 trial. Such an outcome contradicts the
6 tenets of a democratic state." You wrote
7 that in 2004, correct?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. The only change in that
10 observation by you with respect to 2005 and
11 2006 would be as a result of the amendments
12 we discussed as to the qualifications of
13 judges and how they are appointed, correct?

14 A. Yes, but I do think that there
15 is -- I mean the whole idea, the whole reason
16 for this amendment is what was my criticism.

17 Q. Okay and if you look at the
18 last paragraph here which begins with the
19 words what will be the result?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. You say, "What will be the
22 result in a case where not only is the
23 component that is judged terrorists different
24 from the component that sits in the regular
25 civil system, but also where the law allows

1 GROSS

2 Professor Gross' testimony that all
3 the opinions he intends to express in
4 these cases are stated in his report,
5 I have no further questions. If that
6 changes, I will object but if that
7 objection is overruled, I will have
8 more questions for Professor Gross.
9 Thank you, Professor Gross.

10 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

11 MR. STONE: We have a handful
12 of questions.

13 EXAMINATION BY

14 MR. STONE:

15 Q. Professor Gross, in your
16 opinion should an Israeli Civil Court
17 recognize a conviction from a military court
18 in the occupied territories from the year
19 2002?

20 MR. FRIEDMAN: Objection to
21 form.

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. How do you reconcile this view
24 with your testimony earlier today concerning
25 the fairness of military courts that you gave

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

GROSS

when you were being questioned by Mr.
Friedman concerning your book?

MR. FRIEDMAN: Object to the
form.

A. As I tried to explain there are
various degrees of fairness and even though I
had some concerns about the procedures
applied by the military courts, it doesn't
mean that with all the faults and the facts
nonetheless I was satisfied that the whole
machinery, the whole operation as such in my
humble opinion it still should be considered
as comporting with the notion of civilized
system of law and what I understand is the
minimum requirement of due process of law.

Q. I would like to talk briefly
about the element of intent under Israeli
penal law. Is it your testimony that to
establish Credit Lyonnais' liability under
the Prevention of Terrorism Act that
plaintiffs must show that Credit Lyonnais
intended to enable acts of terror?

MR. FRIEDMAN: Object to the
form.